

REMARKS

The Official Action mailed September 23, 2008, has been received and its contents carefully noted. Filed concurrently herewith is a *Request for One Month Extension of Time*, which extends the shortened statutory period for response to January 23, 2009. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that this response is being timely filed.

The Applicant notes with appreciation the consideration of the Information Disclosure Statements filed on October 5, 2001; February 12, 2004; June 24, 2005 (resubmitted July 25, 2005); August 15, 2005; and December 17, 2007.

Claims 1-18, 37-54, 73-90, 109-126 and 145-188 were pending in the present application prior to the above amendment. Claims 37-54, 109-126, 146, 153, 160, 167, 175, 176 and 179-188 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer; and claims 1, 3, 4, 10, 12, 13, 73, 75, 76, 82, 84, 85, 145, 152, 159 and 166 have been amended to better recite the features of the present invention. Accordingly, claims 1-18, 73-90, 145, 147-152, 154-159, 161-166, 168-174, 177 and 178 are now pending in the present application, of which claims 1, 10, 73, 82, 145, 152, 159 and 166 are independent. For the reasons set forth in detail below, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Paragraph 3 of the Official Action rejects claims 1-9, 37-45, 145-151, 173 and 181 as obvious based on the combination of U.S. Patent No. 5,953,003 to Kwon and U.S. Patent No. 5,850,204 to Maekawa. Paragraph 4 of the Official Action rejects claims 10-18, 46-54, 73-90, 109-126, 152-172, 174, 176-180 and 182-188 as obvious based on the combination of Kwon, U.S. Patent No. 5,574,475 to Callahan and Maekawa. The Applicant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained against the independent claims of the present application, as amended.

As stated in MPEP §§ 2142-2143.01, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some reason, either

in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some reason to do so found either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. "The test for an implicit showing is what the combined teachings, knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, and the nature of the problem to be solved as a whole would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art." In re Kotzab, 217 F.3d 1365, 1370, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000). See also In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

The prior art, either alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest all the features of the independent claims, as amended.

Independent claims 1 and 145 have been amended to recite, among other features, "wherein the first unit is configured to stop supply of currents to the plurality of first level shifters while the plurality of second stages of the shift register output the pulses" and "wherein the second unit is configured to stop supply of currents to the plurality of second level shifters while the plurality of first stages of the shift register output the pulses."

Independent claims 10 and 152 have been amended to recite, among other feature, "wherein each of the first to x-th units is configured to stop supply of currents to the plurality of level shifters while the plurality of stages of the shift register in the other units output the pulses."

Independent claims 73 and 159 have been amended to recite, among other features, "wherein the first unit is configured to stop supply of currents to the plurality of first level shifters while the plurality of second stages of the decoder output the pulses"

and "wherein the second unit is configured to stop supply of currents to the plurality of second level shifters while the plurality of first stages of the decoder output the pulses."

Independent claims 82 and 166 have been amended to recite, among other features, "wherein each of the first to x-th units is configured to stop supply of currents to the plurality of level shifters while the plurality of stages of the decoder in the other units output the pulses."

The Applicant respectfully submits that Kwon, Maekawa and Callahan, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above-referenced features of the present invention.

Since Kwon, Maekawa and Callahan do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are in order and respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric J. Robinson
Reg. No. 38,285

Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C.
PMB 955
21010 Southbank Street
Potomac Falls, Virginia 20165
(571) 434-6789